



Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

April 29, 2010, 8:30 am – 12:30 pm

**Location: Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge Complex
752 County road 99W
Willows, CA 95988**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Stuart Edell	Butte County Public Works	Member
Tom Ellis	Sacramento West Side Levee District, Land owners in the Colusa Basin, Member of the Board of Directors of Colusa County Farm Bureau.	Member
Ren Fairbanks	Farming, SRWP, BSAGU	Member
Pete Ghelfi	Sacramento Area Flood Control Association	Member
Les Heringer	Sac Valley Landowners Association	Member
Ashley Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	Member
Tom Karvonen	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Alternate
Jason Larrabee	Larrabee Farms, Glenn County	Member
John Linhart	Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency	Member
Amy Lyons	California Department of Fish and Game	Alternate
Eugene Massa Jr.	Colusa Basin Drainage District	Member
Ernie Ohlin	Water Resources for Tehama County	Member
Ben Pennock	GCID, Sacramento River Water Contractors, Glenn County Water Advisory Committee, Stony Creek Fan Conjunctive Water Management Group/ Partners. Association with groups: Technical Advisory Committee Representative	Member
Max Sakato	Reclamation District No. 1500 and CCVFCA	Member
Marty Stripling	River Garden Farms Co., Sacramento River Westside Levee District, Reclamation Districts 108 and 787	Member
Jeremy Arrich	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFMP Program Manager
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO* Representative
Keith Swanson	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Executive Sponsor
Dan McManus	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Lead
Mary Randall	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Co-Lead
Natasha Nelson	CA Department of Water Resources	Alternate
Scott Rice	CA Department of Water Resources (consultant)	Regional

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

Name	Organization	Status
		Coordinator
Roger Putty	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead
Erica Bishop	MWH Americas Inc	Technical Team
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH Americas Inc	Technical Project Manager
Ken Kirby	Kirby Consultant Group	Technical Team
Austin McInerny	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitator
Jodie Monaghan	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support / Notetaker

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Absent:

Bev Anderson	Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum	Member
Patricia Bratcher*	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
John Carlon	River Partners, RHJV	Member
Randy Dunn	City of Colusa	Member
Ryan Luster	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Leigh W. McDaniel	Glenn County BOS, Nor Cal Water Assn, Tehama Colusa Canal Authority, Colusa Basin Drainage District, Farm Bureau	Member
Jas O'Growney	Tehama County RCD	Member
David van Rijn*	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Member

*Alternate attended in their place

ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK:

- Member comments on the Interim Progress Summary (IPS) #1 and the Regional Conditions Report (RCR) are due May 14, 2010. Comments should be sent electronically to cvfmp@water.ca.gov or in writing to: Central Valley Flood Planning Office, Attn: Merritt Rice, P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236.
- Dan McManus will send a follow-up email to members reminding them of the May 14th comment due date.
- Erica Bishop will coordinate sending copies of the SPFC Descriptive Document DVD to work group members who have requested it.
- Michelle Ng will arrange to send copies of the Regional Conditions Report to those members requesting it.

Future Meetings:

- The Valleywide Forum has been scheduled for June 3, 2010, 1:30-5:30p.m. The location will be announced when confirmed.

MEETING RECAP:

(Meeting highlights for use by Work Group members in their communications)

On April 29, 2010, the Work Group concluded its work on Phase1 of the CVFPP.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the RCR and IPS1, key components for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCR and IPS1 characterizes regional conditions within the Central Valley, describes flood management-related problems and associated opportunities within the Central Valley, describes the draft goals, principles, and initial objectives for the 2012 CVFPP. The Work Group is one of five regional work groups in the Central Valley.

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

1. Close Phase 1 work
2. Determine Work Group perspectives regarding the accuracy and approach of the RCR and IPS#1
3. Orient Work Group members on the revised process of developing the 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
4. Review and augment Phase 1 assessment findings
5. Describe next steps in the process, work groups, and opportunities for involvement – invite participation in the next phase

SUMMARY:

Welcome and Greetings

Meeting facilitator Austin McNerny welcomed the meeting participants, led introductions and reviewed the day's agenda.

Opening Remarks and Orientation

Jeremy Arrich introduced himself as the new Chief of the Central Valley Flood Planning Office and shared his background. He has experience in levee investigations and flood as well as planning, operation and feasibility, and design. He commented that he is looking forward to working with those members able to continue as the process moves into Phase 2. Mr. Arrich's goal for Phase 2 is to engage flood management managers and staff even more in the CVFPP process. He invited members to contact him with any questions, ideas or suggestions.

Keith Swanson, DWR, is the new DWR Executive Sponsor for the Upper Sacramento Regional Work Group. Mr. Swanson commented that in his role as the Chief of the Flood Maintenance Office, he is responsible for 300 miles of levees. His goal for Phase 2 is to bring science and information into the process to allow informed decision-making.

RCR and IPS#1

Dan McManus, DWR, began the PowerPoint presentation with an overview of the CVFPP planning process and the four phases of the project. This meeting marks the end of Phase 1. To document the work done in Phase 1, DWR has published two reports: the Regional Conditions Report (RCR) and the Interim Progress Summary (IPS) No. 1. Mr. McManus commented that the RCR is a working document and will be updated to include work done in subsequent phases. Comments will be incorporated into future editions. The IPS is a snapshot in time and will not be revised. Instead, an IPS will be issued after the completion of each phase.

Mr. McManus thanked the work group members for their hard work and their thoughtful comments. He reported that he will not be continuing on to Phase 2 and introduced Mary Randall, who will be taking his place as a DWR Regional Coordinator for the next phase.

Michele Ng, CVFPO, reviewed the contents of the RCR. The purpose of the RCR is to document the first phase of the CVFPP by defining current conditions and future challenges, identifying problems and

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

opportunities, and defining goals, principles and objectives. The RCR reflects state, federal, tribal, regional, local and other perspectives. She also briefly reviewed the IPS #1.

RCR/IPS#1 Discussion, Feedback, Questions

Austin McInerney solicited feedback from work group members using the RCR/IPS #1 Discussion Questions handout. The following comments and questions were received:

Question #1: A major goal in the development of the CVFPP is for documents to fairly represent input received during the planning process and more generally, the broad perspectives of those with a substantial interest in the Plan. *To what extent does the RCR meet that goal? As DWR and the technical team develop future CVFPP products, what suggestions do you have that will continue to support this goal?*

Overall Comments:

- One work group member was impressed that all her comments were incorporated into the RCR.
- Another work group member provided the following specific comments:
 - Chapter 2, page 2-33 refers to Butte Basin throughout section. This section should be reviewed to ensure that the Butte Basin Overflow Area and Butte Basin are distinguished. The entire Basin is not necessarily the overflow area.
 - Chapter 2, page 34, second paragraph says that “sedimentation” may affect storage and conveyance – it should say that “erosion and head cuts” may affect...
 - Chapter 3, page 19 identifies facilities “not constructed to DWR/Corps standards.” In actuality, DWR and the Corps built the facilities in 1986. It must be assumed they were constructed to DWR and Corps standards – and therefore incorrect to say that *all* facilities were not designed to DWR/Corps standards. A suggestion was made to list only those facilities *not* designed to Corps standards. Keith Swanson responded that if we haven’t captured this section correctly, we need to work with you to get a better understanding of the issue and capture it accurately.
- A work group member suggested that facilities be designated if built to standards when constructed, but no longer meet current standards.
- Jeremy Arrich commented that he wants to identify sections of the flood protection system that are designed/ not designed to standards. He also wants to identify sections not meeting standards or the level of performance they were designed for. He also commented that encroachments are a system-wide issue. DWR is in the process of inventorying the current status of levees. As part of the process, each segment should document the “as constructed” feature.
- One member was concerned that the IPS will not be changed, particularly since work group members had many comments to offer.
- One member noted that Chapter 3, page 16 of the RCR states that the local maintaining agency (LMA) is responsible for encroachments. The statement infers that the LMA issues permits – which it does not. The member was concerned that people reading the RCR will assume that its contents are fact. The member requested that DWR consider an addendum capturing the comments and documenting how DWR responded.
- Given that the documents will not be revised, one member was unhappy that the work group members did not have a chance to review the final documents before they were released. (NOTE: It was affirmed by the Technical Team that the RCR is a working document – always a draft; never a final. Yung-Hsin Sun, MWH, communicated that MWH will work with DWR to summarize all comments and identify actions to be taken to address inaccuracies.)

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

- Ken Kirby commented that the RCR will likely not see widespread distribution; it is more a working document for the work groups. Mr. Kirby commented that an addendum could be published if there are inaccuracies. Jeremy Arrich supported this suggestion.
- Michele Ng reported to the work group members that more detailed description of facilities and their deficiencies is being captured in another companion document, the Flood Control System Status Report (FCSSR). The FCSSR is looking at the authorized purpose of a levee segment. Ms. Ng also noted that the CVFPP will dig deeper and assess whether the features meet the needs – regardless of the authorized purpose.
- Several members asked for a copy of the FCSSR and DVD copies of the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) Descriptive Document.
- Another member was concerned that the history of the flood control system is being lost. The member said DWR needs to understand what and why things happened.
- Dan McManus commented that a technical report is being developed which compiles the historical background and events. Jeremy Arrich noted that this is not part of the CVFMP and funding issues are making it difficult to undertake. Ken Kirby noted that a compilation of historical events is being developed and will be captured in a technical memorandum.
- Another member commented that issues need to be described based on science and not opinion. Keith Swanson noted that early in the planning process information may be opinion-based and then followed by programs to develop the science behind the understanding.
- Keith Swanson indicated that DWR will continue to collect data and document flood control structures. There are different ideas about performance. An example is the 1957 profile vs. the O&M manuals. The long-term goal is to develop hydraulic models to evaluate reaches within the CVFPP. The model will not be ready for the 2012 CVFPP, but should be available for use in developing the 2017 update. He commented that the work group needs to help DWR set priorities.
- A member pointed out that Chapter 3 had many unanswered questions. It was suggested that the questions need to be communicated with the Legislature so DWR doesn't get boxed in next year.
- A member asked about the definition of "sustainable" on page 9 of the IPS. How will the definition be applied – particularly regarding the concept of financial feasibility? It was agreed that this will be a challenge, but Ken Kirby pointed out that research suggests you must have all three pieces (socially, environmentally, and financially feasible) to be sustainable.
- In the context of the importance of history and understanding how things behave, a member commented that RD108 pumps were reported to be modeled correctly even though model results were contrary to what was actually observed in the field.
- Keith Swanson agreed that it is important to ground-truth model results to ensure models accurately predict results. Adaptive management techniques must be used to successfully model reaches of the river.
- A comment was made that models were designed to model high and low flows – but not medium flows. The medium flows can also cause erosion.

Mr. McNerny then posed Question 2 to the group with the following responses:

Question #2: Many of the Phase 1 Work Group discussions focused on the potential scope of the 2012 CVFPP as well as the long term vision for the plan. With direction from the Legislature and input from Work Group members, DWR worked to clarify the scope by using the RCR and IPS to articulate a series of CVFPP goals and principles. In particular, DWR has explicitly called out Public Safety as a primary goal. *Thinking about the steps DWR has taken to clarify the planning area and primary goal, to what extent do the RCR and IPS help establish the scope of the CVFPP? What additional work needs to be done in Phase 2 to address scope and goals issues?*

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

- Yung-Hsin Sun reminded members that the CVFPP planning area is larger than the area of the State Plan of Flood Control. He recommended that members look at the supporting goals as well as the main goals.
- One member pointed to what appear to be conflicting goals. "Future CVFPP Updates" on page 12 states that CVFPP updates will review and realign goals and objectives. Page 20 of the same document states that the goals are broad and enduring. A brief discussion suggested that the two statements are compatible. The update will review the goals every five years, but DWR does not expect them to change appreciably. The actions and priorities may change, but the goals are not likely to change. DWR is trying to convey that it has a vision, but it will be adaptive.
- Another member said that, in Chapter 2 of the RCR, the table listing the benefits of restoring the floodplain visually appears to diminish the value of the ecosystem.
- A question was asked why public safety was not the primary goal. Ken Kirby responded that Flood Risk Management is public safety.
- Another question was asked: If the primary goal is flood risk management and the state only has fiscal responsibility for the State Plan of Flood Control, why doesn't the SPFC include the entire flood risk? Ken Kirby responded that legislation directed DWR to look at the SPFC and the entire flood system. The SPFC refers to sections that the State is responsible for. DWR can add segments.
- A suggestion was made to not make Valley residents feel like they're protected when they're not. A sub-bullet should be added that says DWR will look at adding facilities and areas to the SPFC.
- Another suggestion was made to add a supporting goal to "Improve flood risk management" of providing better understanding of flood control structures. It is important for the public to understand the system and what it protects. It would allow members of the public to understand why they need to pay for flood control.
- One member said education is a goal that should be added. A comment was made that the third bullet under Flood Risk Management on page 21 of the IPS speaks to public education. Ken Kirby clarified that education is an action to support the Plan. The Plan itself will not educate; the actions of the Plan will educate. There are many Management Actions under development that address education and increasing public understanding of flood risk.
- A comment was made that nothing in the IPS acknowledges the real flood risk. Project levees generally perform as expected; it's the non-project levees that tend to fail or not perform as needed. The IPS and future presentations should be clear about project vs. non-project levees.

Mr. McInerney commented that the previous discussion addressed some of Questions 3 and 4. The following comments were recorded:

Question #3: Thinking about the content of the RCR, please describe any major gaps, inaccuracies of data or other red flags that must be addressed as we move forward into Phase 2.

Question #4: The IPS was designed to serve as a summary of work to date and briefing document for broad use by decision makers and interested parties in the CVFPP process. *Thinking of how you or others may use the IPS, to what extent does it serve the purpose it was designed for? What suggestions can you offer to improve the IPS for future phases of the CVFPP process?*

- The IPS should have an Executive Summary. It should summarize: What did we find? What common themes emerged among the regions? The Executive Summary should be on page 1 and be readable by someone other than DWR and MWH. Yung-Hsin Sun agreed to add an Executive Summary to future IPS documents.
- A recommendation was made to delete the multiple references to "open and transparent" process.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

- A question was asked about the material that will be presented at the Valleywide Forum. Ken Kirby responded that summary versions of the documents would be developed for the Forum.
- A comment was made that on page 23 of the IPS, sustainable policies for small scale agriculture was included. While agriculture is a part of business and industry, that inference does not reflect the level of discussion in this work group. There was general agreement that agriculture needs to be stressed.
- Another comment suggested that the second bullet under levels of agreement on page 23 doesn't adequately capture the concept that the flood management system is part of an integrated process.
- One member questioned the meaning of "replenishment of productive agricultural soils" in the same bullet. Currently when flood waters overflow levees, the top soil is washed away and trash is left. A suggestion was made to remove that phrase. Ken Kirby clarified that the Goals were a statement of what we'd like the flood control system to do; the Levels of Agreement is a statement of what the flood system doesn't do.
- Concern was expressed that the programmatic Environment Impact Report/Environmental Assessment planned for the CVFPP will be broad in scope and not project specific. The DWR team assured the work group that the EIR/EA will not be project specific.
- A question was asked: Will the Delta hold upstream residents accountable and/or liable for changes to the flood control system? The concern is that every new house built in a northern area could require payment to the Delta. Ken Kirby responded that there are limits to enforcement, but the general thought is that you can't negatively impact downstream folks. It was agreed that it has to be an integrated system.

Review of Draft Phase 1 Assessment and Next Steps

Referring to the Communications and Engagement Phase 1 External Assessment Executive Summary and the PowerPoint, Austin McInerney reviewed the Phase 1 Assessment. He noted that page 24 of the IPS summarizes the key points from the assessment. In general, the work group agreed with the findings.

Program Manager's Remarks

Apologizing for needing to leave early for another meeting, Jeremy Arrich thanked everyone for their participation in Phase 1 and encouraged their participation in Phase 2. He asked for questions and comments to assist him as he continues to get up-to-speed on CVFPP issues. The following questions and comments were recorded:

Comment: A historical document is strongly encouraged. It is important for legislators to understand flood issues, particularly from a historical perspective

Comment: Hope that conflicts between DWR, USACE, and FEMA are resolved - specifically the definition of 100-year protection and the vegetation policy.

Response: Gary Bardini, DWR Division Chief, is trying to align DWR with USACE; the California Levees Roundtable is being reconstituted into the California Flood Management Roundtable. In addition, some differences between the State and the feds are because DWR doesn't think some things are implementable. An example is penetrations. At issue is the coordination, funding and prioritization of issues.

Comment: Who will be on the Roundtable? It should include CDFA. Dave Patis or John Felix would be a good candidate.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

Comment: The goal of the Roundtable should be uniformity of expectations for levee maintenance. Inspections, operations and maintenance, etc. should be uniform.

Response: DWR may have more interaction with LMAs. DWR is trying to develop strategies to share best practices such as erosion control and rodent control.

Overview of Phase 2 and Next Steps

Roger Putty, MWH, presented a preview of Phase 2. Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Putty remarked that Phase 2 will address Management Actions. The focus will be the development of single actions to address one or more goals. He commented that there may be a need to revisit some of the Phase 1 issues if additional information is needed to develop effective management actions to address a specific issue. He reminded the work group members of the legislative timeline. DWR will forward the Draft CVFPP to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board in January 2012. The Board is required to adopt a Plan by July 1, 2012.

Phase 2 will be structured differently. The regional Work Groups are the anchor to Phase 2. They will meet at the beginning and the end of the phase. Two rounds of workshops will be scheduled in between to integrate across regions. Topic work groups will be mini taskforces to look at specific topics. Their work product will feed into the Regional Work Groups. There could very likely be sub-committees whose work will also feed back to the Regional Work Groups. Phase 2 will start in early June and conclude by August or September. Work group members can choose to attend (or not) as many workshops as they wish.

Responding to feedback from work group members for DWR and the consultants to do initial document development, Mr. Putty reported that 800-plus management actions have been listed to date. MWH is compiling the management actions and working with DWR to evaluate and prepare the management actions for review by work groups in Phase 2. The following questions were captured:

Q: How will management actions be related to entities outside of the CVFPP (ex. Reservoir reoperations)?

A: Actions involving outside entities such as reservoir reoperations will be coordinated. Also management actions will include the pros and cons of the action and the methodology needed to coordinate and accomplish the action.

Q: Management actions are descriptions of actions that could be taken – not specific projects. How dependent is one management action on something else? Does DWR plan to identify the entire universe of possibilities?

A: Phase 2 will be different. Management actions will include characteristics, effects, impacts and dependencies.

Comment: DWR and the consultants are strongly encouraged to send meeting materials at least one week prior to a meeting. It is too hard to address a document in a meeting without the benefit of having reviewed it prior.

Response: Agreed.

Q: How will the workshops be structured – one in each region?

A: The goal of the workshops is to integrate regions. There may be one or two workshops on the same topic – or one workshop on a topic, but locations would be rotated.

Comment: Suggest that the workshops be conducted as a webcast.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

In response to a question of what other stakeholders should be included in Phase 2, a suggestion was made to include tribal interests and the BIA.

Updates, Q&A

The Valleywide Forum is scheduled for June 3rd from 1-5:30 pm in West Sacramento. The Forum will be available via webcast, with the link sent out to participants soon. It will be an opportunity for everyone to hear what each of the work groups accomplished. The forum will be open to the public as well as work group members.

Keith Swanson acknowledged the success of the Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group and thanked everyone for their time and participation.